



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,675	03/30/2001	Barbara A. Christensen	RA 5365 (33012/312/101)	9210
27516	7590	06/03/2005	EXAMINER	
UNISYS CORPORATION			HU, JINSONG	
MS 4773			ART UNIT	
PO BOX 64942			PAPER NUMBER	
ST. PAUL, MN 55164-0942			2154	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/822,675

Applicant(s)

CHRISTENSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Jinsong Hu

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1- 20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lim et al. (US 6,434, 619).

4. As per claims 1-2, Lim teaches the invention as claimed including a data processing system having a user terminal for accessing an application [CSM service director, Fig. 2] coupled to a data base management system [CSM agent, Fig. 2] responsively coupled to said user terminal via a publicly accessible digital data communication network [col. 2, lines 20-30], the system comprising a user interface module coupled to said user terminal [customer end-user browsers, Fig. 2] via said publicly accessible digital data communication network [www, Fig. 2] and to said data

Art Unit: 2154

base management system which communicates with said application via said data base management system [col. 3, lines 10-40; col. 4, lines 19-23 & 40-58].

5. As per claim 3, Lim teaches the user terminal further comprises an industry compatible personal computer having a commercially available browser [customer end-user browsers, Fig. 2].

6. As per claim 4, Lim teaches the application and said user interface module are resident within a single server [col. 4, lines 40-58].

7. As per claims 6-9, since they are apparatus claims of claims 1-4, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-4 above.

8. As per claims 11-14, since they are method claims of claims 1-4, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-4 above.

9. As per claims 16-19, since they are means plus function claims of claims 1-4, they are rejected for the same basis as claims 1-4 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2154

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 5, 10, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim et al. (US 6,434, 619) as applied to claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-19 above, in view of Gebauer (US 6,446,117).

12. As per claims 1, 10, 15 and 20, Lim teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Lim does not specifically teach the data base management system is Classic MAPPER.

13. However, Gebauer on the other hand teaches a data base management system is Classic MAPPER. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Lim and Gebauer because utilizing Gebauer's classic MAPPER in aaa's system would improve the functionality by allowing user generating various reports [Gebauer, col. 2, lines 27-30]. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Lim's system with Gebauer's classic MAPPER to improve the functionality of the system.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/13/04 for claims 1-20 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that (1) the user interface module in Lim's system is within the user terminal; (2) Lim does not teach "application" and "user interface module" are located within a single server; (3) Lim does not teach the limitations in claims 11-14; (4) The motivation for 103(e) rejection is improper.

15. Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's remarks:

A. As to point (1), there is no any language in the claim 1 directs to the limitation that the user interface module should be physically separated from or detached to the user terminal. Furthermore, applicant claimed the user interface module "coupled to" the user terminal, it does not specify these two elements could not be attached together. Thus, Lim teaches the limitation in claim 1.

B. As to point (2), applicant fails to consider the teaching of Lim for including "service application" and client user interface module in server [col. 4, lines 40-51], applicant should consider the teaching of entire system, not only focus on one single drawing.

C. As to point (3), Lim teaches the detail steps for handling requests as applicant claimed in claims 11-14 [col. 5, lines 9-45].

D. As to point (4), the motivation for combining both references are based on the knowledge of one person of ordinary skill in the art and logical reason, it is not based on examiner's assumption.

Accordingly, both references are relevant references.

16. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

17. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jinsong Hu

May 27, 2005



VIET D. VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER